

REMARKS

The claims subject to this Office Action have been rejected as being indefinite and as obvious over the indicated prior art. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments herein and the arguments given below.

This application is subject to a restriction requirement, election of a restriction group and species having been made. Applicants point out that the limitation of dependent claim 16 has been incorporated into all of the independent claims and claim 16 has been cancelled. Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended is still properly part of the elected species of claim 5, and claim 5 has been amended accordingly. Additionally, Applicants point out that in original election requirement **C** for "a single complex analyte (e.g., claims 6-15), Applicants elected claim 6. However, Applicants believe that additional election as between claims 7 and 13, which depend on claim 6, is also required, and Applicants now elect claim 7 in addition to claim 6.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 8-16, 19, 20 and 24 are properly withdrawn and claims 1, 2, 5-7, 17, 18, 21-23, 25 and 26 are the subject of this Office Action.

Claims 16 and 24 are cancelled herein and new claims 27-29 have been added. The limitation of claim 16 has been incorporated into claims 1, 23 and 25. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite "statistically significant difference" in the final limitation, which amendment is supported, e.g., at p. 3, lines 18-31.

Support for new claim 27 can be found at page 6, lines 21-25. Support for claim 28, as a companion claim to claim 18, is derived from Example I. Claim 29 is directed to a preferred embodiment of

the invention. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The claims have been rejected as indefinite for reciting in the independent claims the limitation **"using** an aliquot of said complex analyte as an immunogen to generate a population of monoclonal antibodies directed against antigens in said complex analyte," the Examiner specifically pointing to the term **"using"** as being indefinite. Applicants have amended this limitation in claim 1, 23 and 25 to recite explicitly that which was implicit before, as supported, for example, at page 12, lines 1-12:

injecting a model animal with an aliquot of said abundant protein-depleted complex analyte as an immunogen so as to generate, from individual hybridoma cell lines, a population of monoclonal antibodies directed against antigens in said complex analyte.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite: "wherein said complex analyte is enriched in a specific class of analyte elements before use as an immunogen," as supported, e.g., at p. 11, lines 8-24, to address the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 22, 23 and 26 have been amended as indicated so as to delete the phrases objected to by the Examiner. Thus, Applicants submit that all rejections for indefiniteness have been overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examined claims have been rejected as obvious over Hoogenboom, in view of the recited secondary references.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Hoogenboom is an in-depth review article that relates to the use of antibody-based phage

display methods. The Examiner admits that Hoogenboom does not explicitly detail how to obtain even a first version of a population of monoclonal antibodies that could be directed against antigens in a complex analyte, as required by the claims. Applicants point out, as mentioned above, that the independent claims have been amended to recite:

injecting a model animal with an aliquot of said abundant protein-depleted complex analyte as an immunogen so as to generate, from individual hybridoma cell lines, a population of monoclonal antibodies directed against antigens in said complex analyte.

In this way, Applicants have made explicit that which was implicit in the claims before, that the population of monoclonal antibodies screened in the claimed method is generated via hybridoma technology, not, e.g., via recombination. Applicants submit that none of the recited secondary references, alone or in combination with Hoogenboom, supplies these details of the Applicants' claims that are missing from the primary reference. Thus, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not made a prima facie argument for obviousness and the rejections for obviousness have been overcome.

Applicants submit that all claims in the application are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/588,392  
Filed: August 03, 2006  
TC Art Unit: 1639  
Confirmation No.: 8285

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

**LASZLO TAKACS ET AL.**

Date: October 5, 2009

By: Holliday C. Heine/  
Holliday C. Heine, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 34,346  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP  
Ten Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 542-2290  
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

HCH/nja

384120.1